

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/574,065	LETAVIC, THEODORE J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shouxiang Hu	2811	

All Participants:

(1) Shouxiang Hu.

(2) Robert J. Crawford.

Date of Interview: 17 March 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

All claim rejections set forth in the final rejection.

Claims discussed:

1-18

Prior art documents discussed:

All previously cited references

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

/Shouxiang Hu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2811

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

After reviewing the 02-01-2010 appeal brief, the examiner initiated the interview on March 17, 2010, to expressed the desire to clarify relevant issues raised in the brief, and, if these issues could be adequately clarified, to propose amendment accordingly so as to place the application in condition for allowance. These relevant issues mainly included: whether the distribution of the electric field in the drift region is as linear as a constant, and what is the true relationship between such distribution and the arrangement of the field plate regions. In response, Mr. Crawford said that he needed to consult with his client's in-house attorney to decide whether and/or how to response to these issues.

During a follow-up telephone conversation between Mr. Crawford and the examiner, April 1, 2010, Mr. Crawford notified the examiner that an objection to appeal irregularities had been filed to object to the previous interview/inquiry, per the request of the in-house attorney. The examiner told Mr. Crawford that it was very regretful for any extra burden or inconvenience the previous interview might have caused to applicant, but it was only for the purpose of facilitating prompt disposal for the application. Nevertheless, Mr. Crawford still showed interest on proposals for amendment, which resulted in the examiner's amendment, as confirmed in a further telephone conversation on April 8, 2010.